

**4976. Adulteration and misbranding of "Peppermint Dash." U. S. * * *
v. Wm. J. Stange Co., a corporation. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10 and
costs. (F. & D. No. 5057. I. S. No. 6004-d.)**

On March 10, 1915, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Wm. J. Stange Co., a corporation, Chicago, Ill., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on March 28, 1912, from the State of Illinois into the State of Tennessee, of a quantity of "Peppermint Dash," which was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled, in part: "Peppermint Dash * * *."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Oil, by Mitchell-Howard method:	None.
Solids (per cent by weight)-----	0.20
Color: Tartrazin.	
Ethyl alcohol (per cent by volume)-----	2.35
Methyl alcohol (per cent by volume)-----	14.65

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated for the reason that a substance, to wit, an imitation peppermint product containing no peppermint oil, which said peppermint oil is an essential ingredient of a peppermint product, had been mixed and packed with the article so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and had been substituted wholly for a genuine peppermint product, which it purported to be; further, in that the article had been colored in a manner whereby its inferiority was concealed; and further, in that it consisted of an imitation peppermint product containing wood alcohol, which was an added poisonous and deleterious ingredient, which might render the article injurious to health.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement on the label was false and misleading and deceived and misled in that the statement, "Peppermint Dash," represented to the purchaser that the article was a peppermint product, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not, but was an imitation peppermint product, containing no peppermint oil, which is an essential ingredient of a peppermint product.

On October 16, 1916, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$10 and costs.

CARL VROOMAN, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*